GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING 1160th MEETING SESSION (5TH OF 2004)

+ + + + +

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 2004

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY HOOD Vice Chairperson
KEVIN HILDEBRAND Commissioner
JOHN PARSONS Commissioner

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ANDREW ALTMAN Director, Office of Planning ELLEN MCCARTHY Deputy Directory, Office of Planning

STEVEN COCHRAN Office of Planning
JOEL LAWSON Office of Planning
STEPHEN MORDFIN Office of Planning
JENNIFER STEINGASSER Office of Planning
KAREN THOMAS Office of Planning
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS Office of Planning

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO BASTIDA Secretary, ZC SHARON SCHELLIN Office of Zoning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 DC OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

ON BEHALF OF SQUARE 643 ASSOCIATES, LLC:

CYNTHIA A. GIORDANO, ESQ. Arnold and Porter, LLP

ON BEHALF OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

ALLISON PRINCE, ESQ. Shaw Pittman, LLP

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

I.	PRELI	MINARY MATTERS - MR. BASTIDA
II.	ACTIO:	N ON MINUTES
	Α.	Public Meeting Minutes (draft) of December 8, 2003 (1155th Session) Postponed
	В.	Public Meeting Minutes (draft) of December 11, 2003 (1156th Session) Postponed
	C.	Public Meeting Minutes (draft) of January 12, 2004 (1157th Session) Postponed
	D.	Public Meeting Minutes (draft) of January 29, 2004 (1158th Session) Postponed
III.	STATS	REPORT - OFFICE OF PLANNING
	A.	Office of Planning Monthly Status Report
IV.	CONSE	NT CALENDAR - MR. BASTIDA
	A.	Z.C. Case No. 04-06/02-17 (Minor Modifications - 5401 Western Avenue, N.W.)

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (Cont.)

V.	HEARII	NG ACTION - MR. BASTIDA
	A. B.	<pre>Z.C. Case No. 04-05 (Reservation 13) Z.C. Case No. 03-27 (4600 Brandywine Associates, LLC - Consolidated PUD & Related Map</pre>
	C.	Amendment at 4600 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Z.C. Case No. 03-30 (Square 643 Associates, LLC -
	D.	Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment at 734 First Street, S.W.) Z.C. Case No. 04-01 (American Pharmacists Assoc Consolidated PUD & Map Amendment at 2215 Connecticut Ave., N.W.)
VI.	PROPOS	SED ACTION - MR. BASTIDA
	Α.	Z.C. Case No. 03-29 (GWU - Residence Hall)
VII.	FINAL	ACTION - MR. BASTIDA
	А.	<pre>Z.C. Case No. 03-06 (Southeast Federal Center) Z.C. Case No. 03-26 (P.N. Hoffman) Postponed</pre>
VIII.	LITIG	ATION - MR. BASTIDA
IX.	CORRE	SPONDENCE - MR. BASTIDA
Х.	REPOR'	T OF THE SECRETARY - MR. BASTIDA
	A.	Reminder Schedule
XI.	OTHER	BUSINESS
	А. В.	New Cases Filed:
	C.	Election of Officers
Adjourn		

NEAL R. GROSS

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 6:46 p.m.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

3

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the March 8, 2004 meeting of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia.

My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Kevin Hildebrand and John Parsons.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the wall bin near the door. I would just like to remind everyone present that we do not take public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission specifically requests that someone come forward.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also being webcast live. Accordingly, we ask that you refrain from making any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room, and I ask that you now turn off all beepers and cell phones.

Mr. Bastida, do you have any preliminary matters?

MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chair, the staff has no preliminary matters. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I'm just

NEAL R. GROSS

going to make a few announcements and changes to the agenda. We'll take the action on the minutes and the Office of Planning Status report at the end so we can get to the meat of the agenda right off the bat.

And I want to announce that the second item under final action, which is case number 03-26, we will take that up at a special public meeting on Thursday night, March 11th at 6:15 p.m. And I apologize for anyone who came out for that tonight. We didn't get a copy of the draft order in order to review that for this evening. So we'll take that up again March 11th, this Thursday, at 6:15 p.m.

Then we're ready to move to our first item, which is the consent calendar item, which is the Consent Calendar item, case number 02-17. This is a request for a minor modification to the PUD at 5401 Western Avenue.

Mr. Bastida, I believe we have a recommendation from the Office of Zoning.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, right. Madam Chair, the staff has provided you with all the required information. The staff had provided you with the documents saying that we believe that it is a minor modification, and we recommend that you use -- decide it on the Consent Calendar.

The Office of Planning also has recommended favorable on the proposal. The other parties that were part of this application also have recommended favorable, that you take favorable action on this application. And ANC 3 -- and I mean 4G is -- has advised this office that they intend not to take an official position on this matter. That was the party, the second ANC party on this case.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. We have a series of changes that are being requested to the order, and the changes arise out of an agreement, a settlement agreement, that the Applicant has made with the parties who were in opposition to this case. And I guess the gist of it is that the building has been reduced somewhat in size and somewhat in height, and there have been some changes regarding the manner in which parking will be handled, and a change in the landscape plan, as well as the construction management plan.

Any preliminary comments?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I think this is a joyous end, actually. That is, it's a better design. Citizens are supporting it. I'm remembering the long hearings that we --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It was long. long and --2 3 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The landscape plan, 4 it seems to be a conceptual idea for a water fountain. 5 And I don't know, with the limited materials that we have, that we can really understand what that is. And 6 7 I don't want to delay this, but I just note that it's 8 pretty sketchy to say what a waterfront looks like in this context. 9 10 But otherwise, I think this is vastly 11 improved. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would agree with 13 that, and especially as contentious as the case was, 14 happy that with some -- I know that the Applicant, 15 even though they're asking for minor changes, I'm sure 16 it wasn't easy to make the compromises. But if 17 everyone can be satisfied at the end of the day, I'm satisfied, too, and I think the design is improved. 18 19 Anyone else? 20 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Madam Chair, I would heartily agree with that, and only add that I 21 22 hope that the same level of attention will be paid to 23 the daycare center and the adjacent structure of when that is more fully developed. 24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

Thank you. I would

just note, and I think we need just to go through these individually just to make sure that it's clear what we want in and what we want out.

We have a report from the Office of
Planning on the requested modifications, and they had
added in certain places some additional language that
I think we need to decide whether we want it in or
out. So I'm just going to run through those very
quickly.

In paragraph number two of the decision, they've added the sentence, "The design of the roof structure shall not enable the inclusion of occupyable space not otherwise permitted by 11 DCMR, Section 411."

My view would be there's no harm in leaving it in, and there's no harm in taking out, because I think it goes without saying that there wouldn't be space included as occupyable space that was not otherwise permitted by 11 DCMR, Section 411.

Anyone have any thoughts? Okay. Then

I'll vote to leave it in just because it doesn't hurt
to be absolutely clear.

Under paragraph three, "The affordable housing shall be constructed on site and shall comprise no less than five percent of the additional

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

gross square footage permitted by this project
permitted this project by its approval as a planned
unit development under this order."
I think that was the nature of the proffer
that was made, and this is just clarifying it.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would agree to
leave that in or to add it.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Last is I guess
not not last. Next is what would be new paragraph
ten, near the end, "Landscaping improvement shall be
in accordance with the plans and shall include a
fountain or water feature accessible to the public."
I think, again, this is adding clarity
because the landscape plan does show a water feature,
and it's intended to be accessible to the public. So
this just adds clarity.
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I'm wondering
if we could add to that of at least the size shown on
the plan.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Otherwise, we'll
have a drinking fountain, if we're not careful.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. Just give me
the plan
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right after the

1	word public, of at least the size shown on the plan.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just give me the
3	plan.
4	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh. Same one
5	referenced above. In this paragraph, it says
6	"according to the landscape plans."
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	MR. BASTIDA: The staff will be glad to
9	add the specific plan.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And then
11	lastly is in new paragraph, letter (C), "To vary the
12	number and location of parking spaces not to decrease
13	below the minimum of 1.1 accessible parking spaces per
14	unit, plus four parking spaces for the daycare spaces
15	and eight additional visitor parking spaces." Again,
16	this is adding clarity.
17	Anyone have any reservations about
18	including it? Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Might I add on
20	(D) that we might say something about final selection
21	of exterior materials within the color ranges and
22	material types is proposed based on availability, time
23	of construction, without reducing quality of
24	construction?
25	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's good This

_	nas become a bollerplate. We've never used the word
2	quality. That's a good suggestion.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now that will become
4	our new boilerplate. Okay. Anything else?
5	Then I would move approval of the minor
6	modification, which is case number 04-06, with the
7	inclusions that we just discussed by Office of
8	Planning as well as by the Commission.
9	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any further
11	discussion? All those in favor, please see aye.
12	(Chorus of ayes.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: None opposed. Mrs.
14	Schellin?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record the
16	vote four to zero to one to approve case number 04-
17	06/02-17. Commissioner Mitten moving. Commissioner
18	Parsons seconding. Commissioners Hildebrand and Hood
19	in favor. Commissioner Hannaham not present, not
20	voting.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. The next
22	case is one that Mr. Hood is going to take over. And
23	notwithstanding that this is going to be a rulemaking,
24	I just don't want there to be any concern about my
25	dual role on the Zoning Commission and as the Director

1 of the Office of Property Management. So I'm going to recuse myself, Reservation 13, and Mr. Hood will take 2 3 over. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, 5 Madam Chair. Colleagues, we have in front of us Zoning Commission case number 04-05 for set down. 6 We'll go to the Office of Planning. 7 8 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. It is with 9 10 great pleasure, excitement and a privilege that we 11 present you the outline of a plan we believe will lead 12 to the implementation of a vision of the development 13 of one of our city's most important public resources. 14 The Hill East master plan was adopted by 15 the City Council on October 15th, 2002 for reservation 16 13, also known as the former D.C. General Hospital 17 site. The proposal before you today is to 18 provide a zoning proposal on the property to lead to 19 20 the implementation of the planning principles outlined 21 in the master plan. After careful analysis of these principles 22 23 and guidelines, such as the massing and height, uses and extension of the street grid into the site using 24 25 conventional zoning as provided in the zoning

regulations, we were stymied as to -- as that they did not provide us with the tools to fully implement the plan in a manner that fully reflects the vision of the plan.

After further analysis, we decided that form-base codes was the best tool to implement the master plan. Form-base codes emphasize traditional design integrated with the streets and public spaces, a variety of housing types, mixed use development to minimize the use of automobiles and encourage transit use, orientation of commercial uses to sidewalk and streets, provision of open space and links to residential and commercial uses for the strong pedestrian orientation.

Additionally, design-oriented codes emphasize specifics of the design related to row houses, apartments and store fronts, streetscapes and plazas.

The codes are prescriptive in that they prescribe build-to lines instead of setbacks, typical facade treatment, public use design, and landscaping and planting along the right of ways.

Because of the federal government owns the tract, it was never surveyed and included in the District property identification system, but

identifies properties by square and lot numbers.

Additionally, there are no internal streets on the site. And therefore, as recommended in the master plan, the additional existing Capitol Hill grid system will be extended through the site.

In order to describe development areas on the reservation, the property has been divided into blocks that are identified as blocks O to A. The regulations governing the development of the tract will be in two sections, general regulations governing development and the design guidelines that will give graphic prescriptions and priorities for heights, sighting, and other building elements to address the basic necessities for forming a good public space.

Appendix 1 of the submission outlines the text for a new Hill East district that consists of general regulations for development and addresses the other requirements and uses.

The accompanying design guidelines add further regulations for development. The design guidelines has a regulating plan for the development that is based on the street types on which it fronts.

A streets, which are the primary streets that set the tone and character of the community and serve pedestrians and automobiles equally, and are

mainly Independence Avenue, Water Street and Massachusetts Avenue.

The B streets are secondary streets that are -- that connect primary streets and provide options for access throughout the neighborhoods, such as Burke and C Streets.

C streets are -- streets that provide a means of ccess to service entries and parking structures throughout the neighborhood.

A second portion of the regulating plan addresses building heights that are defined in ranges and increases from 19th Street towards Water Street, and are in three bands ranging from two to four stories, or 24 feet to 50 feet on the western portion of the site, to seven to ten stories, or 80 feet to 110 feet, on the east.

In order to provide transitions from smaller to larger scale buildings, setbacks are required at specified locations.

The plan also identifies special places on the site, such as retail areas that will be allowed in specified places, such as the neighborhood center at the -- Metro Station along 19th Street, and at Massachusetts Avenue near the waterfront, with general entertainment and waterfront uses.

Retail areas are in specified areas to maximize the effect of a concentration of uses. The plan provides general guidelines for architectural character and treatment, including facade treatment, roofline expression and materials based on building types generally found in Capitol Hill neighborhood and other parts of the city.

Additionally, sites along Mass Avenue,
Water Street, Independence Avenue and 19th Street have
been identified for architecturally significant facade
and/or having significant architectural features.

Streetscape guidelines include street trees, planting strips, brick and concrete pave, raised front yards and trees, shrubs and flowers, gates and steps, et cetera.

The public realm areas include an approximately three acre central public park for community use that will be similar in character to other parks on Capitol Hill, such as Lincoln Park, and the monument circle at the terminus of Massachusetts Avenue.

The proposed regulations will provide sufficient detail and provide for greater predictability of potential development and concurrently allow flexibility in development.

The proposed regulation will also facilitate a predicable process for the review of development application, and the Office of Planning recommends that all projects will be contested cases and subject to special exception review by the Zoning Commission.

Corporation Counsel has expressed some concern regarding the formatting of the design guidelines into a format acceptable to the Office of Documents for rulemaking. We will continue to work with the Corporation Counsel towards an acceptable solution.

The Office of Planning has made presentations to ANC 6B of the committee, in addition to having the Reservation 13 Steering Committee, but has representatives of the community and other federal and District agencies.

Generally, there is support for the use of form-based coding on the site. There has been some concerns expressed by the community regarding some of the uses that will be permitted. If this proposal is set down, we will continue to work with the community and refine the proposal prior to the public hearing.

Known uses on the site will include a -- of the school, which is located at -- which will be

19 1 located at 19 and Independence Avenue, as approved by the Zoning Commission in January of 2004 and is slated 2 to open in 2005 school year. 3 The existing 60,000 square feet -- hall 4 5 will be completely renovated to accommodate the reentry and -- center of the Court Services and 6 7 Offender Supervision Agency of the District of 8 Columbia. The building will accommodate 30 to 90 day 9 10 residential treatment program for drug abusers and 11

counseling to parolees, and is scheduled to start operation in June 2005.

As recommended by the master plan, the hospital should be permitted on the site. Howard University is proposing a hospital on block C and/or B and will be developed consistent with the design quidelines.

The proposed Hill East district will provide standards to guide the development to Reservation 13, as envisioned by the community and outlined in the comprehensive plan, the Reservation 13 master plan, and further detailed in the proposed design quidelines.

The Office of Planning therefore recommends that the proposal for a new Hill East

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	district be set down.
2	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms.
4	Brown-Roberts. Colleagues, we have a request from the
5	Office of Planning in front of us. I would just begin
6	by saying this new form-based codes is actually very
7	unfamiliar to me, this new concept. Well, I don't
8	know if it's new or what you have.
9	Ms. Brown-Roberts, let me ask you. Has
10	this concept been done before in the city, first?
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It has not been done
12	in the District of Columbia. No.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. What is the
14	closest jurisdiction in
15	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It has been used in
16	Alexandria, in Virginia, and Arlington.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I won't ask
18	whether it works or not. I'm just, you know, I'm
19	curious. But I'll ask that if its set down for a
20	hearing. I'll state it at the time.
21	Something else you mentioned, if it's set.
22	I think you said it like this. If it's set. I think
23	you said it like this. If it's set down, you will
24	continue to work with the community. What happens if
25	it's not set down?

(Laughter.)
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. That's
I won't you don't have to give me an answer.
MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: If it's not set down,
we will continue to work. I think we will take into
consideration what your concerns are
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: and continue to
work on it, to bring it to a something that we
think is satisfactory, that will be acceptable to the
Commission.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And it's
obviously, you mentioned it, I know one of the issues
that occurred about Reservation 13 was the issue about
the hospital. Obviously, it's in this form base
form-based codes plan. There is a place there for a
hospital?
MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. The master plan
did specify that hospital use was to be permitted on
the site. And in coming up with the uses and in
looking at where we did specify the area along
Independence Avenue to accommodate the hospital.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
MS. McCARTHY: And we probably should add,

Mr. Hood, in answer to your question before about what

the impact would be of not setting it down that Howard University Hospital is anxious to get in their planning, and one thing that they need to know is what the zoning envelope is that will be available to them, to guide them and then doing their drawings.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Unless there's any questions, we have a proposal. Any comments? Mr. Parsons?

about this. I have to reflect on how long it took, and it isn't done yet, to do the simple WO zone. That process started two years ago next month. This whole idea of form-based code is new, obviously, to us. And we have no understanding of it, no understanding of the value of it.

My understanding, limited that I have, is it has been used occasionally or as a new idea in an area that's built out. That is, a Wisconsin Avenue. Shouldn't bring up Wisconsin Avenue. That is, how do we take advantage of the architectural fabric we've got and what is the kind of form that we want, Washington Street and Alexandria Columbia Pike and Arlington. And I find it strange to apply it to this circumstance.

But I go beyond that. I had no idea when

I saw this mater plan, I don't know in what form, wherever I've seen it over the past year, that we were going to result in 110 foot high buildings along the waterfront. That's exactly the opposite of what we did at Buzzards Point. So I'm very troubled about the height of the buildings.

But, you know, this master plan has a residential feel to it, a sense of community. But when I look at the diagrams of the 110 foot buildings, I just say -- I don't get it. I don't understand it.

So I'm very troubled by it. And I would say that we should have -- unless you're not in a hurry. I mean, if you're not in a hurry, maybe this is the place to try it. But I see at least 18 months before we have a text that we can apply to this, based on past experience. That's my concern. As opposed to a straight zoning and get on this, like we did with the Southeast Federal Center.

MS. McCARTHY: I think, Mr. Parsons, that straight zoning, as Ms. Brown-Roberts indicated, straight zoning is what we tried first. But this plan was adopted by the City Council as the plan that is to be followed on Reservation 13.

And because our zoning code tends to equilibrate height and intensity of use, there was no

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

way, since the height marches in one direction, westeast, and the intensity of use marches in another
direction, there was no -- each of the existing zoning
classifications that we attempted to put on various
sections of the plan ended up being inappropriate for
one reason or another.

So it was only out of great frustration with not having anything in our existing zoning that accommodated those needs and having a plan that had been worked out through a consensus process with the community and adopted by the City Council with those heights, with the 110 feet and all of what we're taking about in this plan --

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm actually shocked at the heights. I don't know I was asked and I didn't listen or what. But I'm just -- I'm really troubled by that.

MR. ALTMAN: I would just add that I think that part of -- I don't know at the time the issue about the height or the specifics, I don't -- whether it's a form-based code or the regular zone that you're familiar with, we had the same discussion. So I don't know that -- in other words, I think that's a discussion worth having, and we can go into the reasons how that came about in terms of the setback

from the water and the park and all the things that give it distance from the water so it's not at the water's edge. Different from a completely urbanized area like the Buzzard Point, where you're trying to ensure that they're set back here. You have some significant setbacks.

But putting that aside, so I think that's a good discussion to have about the heights and how they came about. The idea of -- I don't think that the time issue, in terms of will it take that much longer to go through form-based zoning versus the zone you know -- it may be -- maybe it will be quicker because you're more familiar.

But I don't know that it would produce the outcome that you want. I mean, we struggled with it. We frankly, as Ellen McCarthy said, were going to go with zones that we knew but realized that in light of what we were trying to achieve at this site, in terms of design, in terms of use issues, location of retail, articulation of the buildings, setbacks of the buildings, that you were actually -- our concern was that -- was to take a new approach, which is an approach that's frankly been done all around the county, and to apply it here so that we -- that one of the concerns that we had heard was that it was in fact

more complicated trying to use some of the existing zones to achieve this outcome than just saying let's start with a chapter that you could easily look to in the zoning code and say, Hill East zoning, here's a chapter on it. I can read it. I understand exactly what it is you're looking for.

I don't go in with the notion of CR, a CR modified 12, 13, 14 times, but tell me exactly what it is you're looking for and we can respond to that with a clear direction and certainty.

And, you know, I think the details of what that -- what's in that zone are a good discussion to have, and that's what we were hoping in terms of set down.

And frankly, in light of discussions with the hospital and with the medical campus, we thought it was important to have at least a framework set down that can then be the basis for discussion, sooner rather than later.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, could we set down a -- this with a zoning category for the hospital in case this falls apart on us? I mean, if that's urgent. I don't know what the zoning -- it's pretty easy to zone a hospital, I would think. But --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You might want to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 turn your mic on so you're on the record. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Did you try base 2 3 zoning with a special HE overlay, which is more traditional? Of course you did. 4 5 MS. McCARTHY: Yes, we did, and yes. the overwhelming reaction from the community meeting 6 was you're trying to get the overlay to do way too 7 8 many things. 9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. 10 MS. McCARTHY: I mean, a good example is 11 the open space, the park in the middle. As you 12 pointed out before, with the exception of WO, we have 13 no open space zones. 14 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right. 15 MS. McCARTHY: And so the only zone that 16 was available to us that was even remotely close was 17 WO, but even that would have provided for .5 FAR of 18 development, and we wanted a park there, and so did 19 the community. 20 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: One question that comes to mind for me is form-based code to find 21 22 in the zoning code, or would we have to write the 23 zoning ordinances before we tried to enact them? MS. McCARTHY: Well, this would be a new 24 25 chapter of the code just like when CR was created, and we would have to deal with those aspects of the code that would be changed, but the rest of it would -- we'd rely on the rest of it in terms of nonconforming uses and that sort of thing.

It is very different, but I should add, in addition to the examples that we've used, it's also being used in Nashville, Davison County, in Minneapolis -- no, not Minneapolis -- in Duluth, in a variety -- in some big cities as well as in some suburban areas.

So it's new, but it's increasingly being used in different places where the recognition is that you can more accurately prescribe what it is that you want to see, rather than just using Euclidean zoning.

MR. ALTMAN: I think the answer also of what you're saying is that you don't need to create sort of what would be enabling legislation in order to then do the form-based code because it's not -- really all it is, is specifying, if you will, the envelopes and the uses. And so it's almost like just creating a special zone, and we're just defining it as a discrete chapter.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be worthy to have a generic conversation and meeting about he form-based codes

before we took action on one specifically.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That sounds like a good point. But I was thinking about that -- like we normally have roundtables. But when I look at what's presented in front of us, and I'm understanding of all charrettes and all the many, many meetings that have been going on with Reservation 13.

Colleagues, I'm wondering if we could probably hash a lot of that out if we were to set it down. And one thing that's unique about this, all of us are going to have to agree because there's only three of us. It's not like we can leave one person out this time.

But I would think that we would maybe be able to learn this form-based code system and also, from my standpoint, be educated if we -- obviously it's new and it's going on in other areas, jurisdictions.

Change is inevitable. It's going to happen. So I would be inclined to set it down and be educated as opposed to just doing a roundtable, and then come back and deal with this secondhand, because there are some pertinent issues that are very important to the city. And that's -- one of them, I

know, is the hospital.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: And certainly, being new on the Board, I don't mean to question the work that you've done for the last couple of years on this process. It's just that I'm stepping into it, and it's very new to me, and I appreciate your taking the time to explain it to me.

MR. ALTMAN: The only thing I was going to add is that I appreciate that and we take no -- ask as many questions as you like, and we'll spend as much time. I sincerely -- because it is complicated coming into this.

I would say the reason that we wanted to set it down, and then I think we're very open to having however forum the Commission would like on form-based zoning and on this in particular. And I can make modifications as we go along.

In a sense, it's almost a do no harm argument in that I'm concerned from the community perspective in the work that we've done. They're very concerned about uses they don't want coming on to the site, and in a sense, without it being zoned, it's unprotected from those kinds of uses.

People just see an unzoned site, and there are all kinds of various things people may want to put

on there that would not be protected.

So in a way, we can always make modifications. We can always make changes. But at least there's a message about what the overall at least use and intent is, and then it can be modified.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess I'll agree to do this with a couple of conditions. When we first did the overly zones a long time ago, the Committee of a Hundred brought witnesses brought witnesses from New York and I think San Francisco, to tell us how overlay zones work, because we were frightened of them. What is this?

And we -- I think would be -- if we could do that, not the one that was adopted in Arlington last week, but the one that was developed in Nashville five years ago and is built out, to show, you know, what they would have done different or something. I think that would be very important.

And I don't know whether we can afford to bring people in, but maybe the Committee of a Hundred could do it again. But, I mean, they were very in favor of overlay zoning. And that was a great move for us.

And I sense this is the same. This isn't the only place we're going to use this, if it works.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. McCARTHY: No. We, in fact, Mr. Parsons, we had already -- we had always figured that 2 3 we would do that at the hearing as being in some outside experts and some information about how this 4 5 worked in other cities. In fact, one of the primary experts 6 7 actually lives on Capitol Hill, although he does 8 consulting all over the country. So I think it would be fairly easy to bring them in. 9 10 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the second 11 thing is, you've got to change page 28 of the report 12 because it makes me so nervous I can't sleep. But 13 this isn't Grant Park in Chicago. Those images just 14 drive me nuts. So if you're wondering why I get so 15 excited is when your consultant borrowed some -- I'm 16 kidding. You don't have to change the report. 17 think I've made my point. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So all right. 19 Parsons, you made the point. Can you make the motion? 20 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: With hesitancy, I'm 21 not going to make the motion. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You're not going 23 to make the motion? COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No. I might vote 24 25 for it.

1 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Is there time for a little discussion on some of the body of the 2 3 report? 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure, sure. 5 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: One of the things I was really pleased to see was the concept of 6 7 integrating the Capitol Hill streetscaping grid into the Reservation 13 site. But then when I looked at 8 the plan, I saw that almost instantly it was violated 9 10 by the interruption of 20th Street, by a block 11 protruding into that whole grid system to minimize the 12 -- I guess the footprint of the park. 13 And I would ask that you might look at 14 that to see if that's really valid. I know parks 15 typically on the Hill are bounded within the street 16 grid, if you look at Stanton Park of Lincoln Park. 17 They don't obstruct traffic flow. They actually work 18 with it in harmony. 19 And I think that could be -- expanding the 20 park could be quite a nice feature for this area of 21 the community. 22 And also, on your page 10, I note we were 23 talking about architecturally sensitive facades or significant facades. We're creating this Hill East 24 25 park, and yet we're not designating the facade fronts

1 that face the park as architecturally significant. And I think that that's a bit of an oversight. 2 3 The other question I had was how Karrick Hall falls within -- with the language about the uses 4 5 north of Massachusetts Avenue, and if you could comment on how that works within your -- the 6 7 language, I'd appreciate it. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Hildebrand, just so you know, this is the time for us 9 10 to ask questions, so when we get to the hearing point, 11 some of those questions or issues that we have will be 12 resolved. 13 So with that, I make a motion that we set 14 down Zoning Commission case 04-05 with the conditions 15 and the conditions expressed by Commissioner Parsons. 16 If you want to repeat them, I think it was basically 17 that we bring somebody that's up to speed on this form-based codes issue. 18 19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the other one 20 was in jest. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I wasn't 21 22 even going to mention the other one, but -- and also, the concerns of Commissioner Hildebrand. 23 I think that's been duly noted. 24 25 I'll ask for a second. I'll ask again for

1	a second.
2	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I'll second it.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. It has
4	been moved and seconded. All those in favor, aye?
5	(Chorus of ayes.)
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any opposition?
7	Abstentions?
8	(No response.)
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So ordered.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
11	three to zero to two. Commissioner Hood making the
12	motion. Commissioner Hildebrand seconding.
13	Commissioner Parsons in favor. Commissioner Hannaham
14	not present, not voting. Commissioner Mitten not
15	voting, having recused herself. And I would just
16	confirm that this will be a rulemaking case.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think it's a
18	contested
19	MR. BERGSTEIN: It will be a rulemaking.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Rulemaking?
21	MR. BERGSTEIN: It will be a rulemaking
22	case. Yes.,
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
24	And Ms. Schelling, forgive me for not calling for the
25	vote.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: That's okay. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm a little out 2 3 of practice. MS. SCHELLIN: Sorry I just jumped in 4 5 there. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: For the record, 6 our Chairperson has rejoined us. 7 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood. Next is case number 03-27, which is 4600 Brandywine 9 10 Associates, LLC, a consolidated PUD and related map 11 amendment at 4600 Wisconsin Avenue. And we'll turn to 12 the presentation by the Office of Planning. 13 MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Chair and 14 members of the Commission. My name is Steven Mordfin 15 with the Office of Planning. And the Applicant has 16 applied for a planned unit developing and related map 17 amendment to assign the C2B District to 4600 Wisconsin Avenue for the construction of a six-story mixed use 18 19 building. 20 Subject property zone C2N is located with 21 the Tenley Town Metro Station off-station housing 22 opportunity area, a multi-neighborhood commercial 23 center and the generalized land use map recommends the mixed use/land use for the site, including medium 24

density residential and moderate density commercial.

The application requests waiver to the minimum required PUD area and variances to maximum lot occupancy minimum rear yard and minimum residential recreation space.

The application proposed the following public benefits and amenities. Replacement of a playground equipment at Janey Elementary School, IT resources for Tenley Library, repair to the Wilson Senior High buildings, contributions towards the renovation -- of Fort -- Park, and provision of three affordable housing units, and the purchase of historic District street signs for the -- Historic District.

The Office of Planning believes that the proposed PUD and related map amendment are not inconsistent with the economic development of the comprehensive plan, and that it would provide retail and residential development near a Metro rail station, the housing element in that it will provide multiunit housing near a Metro rail station and within a housing opportunity area, the environmental protection element in that it will provide for clustering of residences near a Metro rail station, the transportation element in that it will provide a mixed use building near a Metro rail station, the land use element in that it will provide for new housing within a housing

2.0

1	opportunity area and near a Metro rail station, and
2	will replace two non-residential structures with a
3	structure containing new housing near a Metro rail
4	station, and the Ward 3 plan in that it will provide
5	housing, including affordable housing units near a
6	Metro rail station and expand housing stock, and
7	contribute a greater variety of housing types,
8	opportunities and choices.
9	The application is also not inconsistent
10	with many of the principles and recommendations for a
11	transit-oriented neighborhood as defined in
12	transformation or creating transit-oriented
13	neighborhood centers in Washington, D.C.
14	The Office of Planning recommends that the
15	Zoning Commission set down for public hearing to
16	propose PUD and related map amendment.
17	And that concludes the presentation from
18	the Office of Planning.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
20	Mordfin. Are there any questions for Mr. Mordfin or
21	comments on the application. Mr. Parsons?
22	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I'm quite
23	anxious to hear about a planning process that's going
24	on in the same vicinity, and I can't help but notice

in the newspaper that that's fallen on some

1 controversy. Why is it that we're going to deal with this case without the context of a plan? 2 MS. McCARTHY: Mr. Parsons, we're very 3 4 comfortable in proceeding without the completion of 5 the upper Wisconsin area corridor study because even if that study is submitted and adopted by the Council 6 as a small area plan, it only constitutes supplemental 7 8 guidance to the comprehensive plan. That's its official legal status, as the Office of Corporation 9 10 Counsel has advised us in the past. 11 And therefore, it can't supplant or change 12 in major ways the recommendations of the comprehensive 13 It can supplement it. It can provide 14 additional guidance. 15 But we feel that looking at the 16 comprehensive plan, the guidance provided by the 17 comprehensive plan about the intended uses of Tenley Town are quite clear, and they quite clearly encompass 18 a project like the one that is provided for set down 19 20 today. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So the intent at 21 22 the end of the planning process, which I assume has to 23 be approved by the City Council? MS. McCARTHY: We -- it wouldn't 24 25 necessarily have to be, but we have indicated that we

1 plan to submit it to the City Council. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So at the end of 2 3 the planning process, you wouldn't be bringing to us zoning changes to conform to it? 4 5 MS. McCARTHY: We have indicated that it was not our plan to rezone in response to the plan, 6 7 that we will be indicating what is, we hope with 8 agreement from all parties, what is an appropriate development envelope. 9 10 And that if any of that development 11 envelope happens to be greater than what is permitted 12 under the current zoning envelope, that we would reach 13 that through a PUD process on each site, where we can assess amenities, do a detailed examination of traffic 14 15 impacts and other infrastructure impacts, and do 16 detailed design review. 17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So in this case, 18 however, you're changing the zoning? 19 MS. McCARTHY: And in those cases that one 20 would come in with a PUD and map amendment, we would 21 then go throughout that process. 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh. So rather than 23 taking a look at C2B and this entire stretch of Wisconsin Avenue, we'll take them one at a time? 24 25 MS. McCARTHY: Our intention is one of the

41 1 -- what is generally regarded -- our intention is to get the best of both worlds. What is criticized is a 2 3 process where one goes project by project with PUDs 4 without any reference to a greater whole. 5 What we've tried to do in the plan is to say here's the greater whole. Let's look at the 6 corridor comprehensively. Let's indicate what would 7 8 be appropriate heights, and at this point we haven't -- we've been dealing with heights and stories. 9 10 We haven't even really provided detailed 11 guidance on density because we thought that was better 12 determined on a project-by-project basis where one can 13 assess the particular impacts of that project through 14 the PUD process. 15 So we want to provide predictability and 16 an overall sense of the framework, and then within

that, to have the additional protection that's provided by the PUD process so that if someone wants to go to the full zoning envelope, they have to go through that process to reach it.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And when do you expect this plan to be completed?

MS. McCARTHY: It's really not clear. have -- the mayor has indicated that he would like us to aim for consensus. We are in the process of

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

digesting over a hundred written submissions, several hours worth of transcript, several resolutions by ANCs and various civic organizations.

And once those are all digested and put into a database, then we will begin to revise the plan. And we've indicated that that will be at least six weeks from the time that the comments were submitted February 20th. But want to take the time to do it right, and if it has to be more than six weeks, it will be more than six weeks.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.

MS. McCARTHY: We then indicated that we would provide at least a month after that time, after we release the revised report, for all of the parties to take a look at the revised plan and get comments in. And we would, depending on the comments, then do one more revision before we send it to the City Council, which would then have further public hearings before they would adopt it.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay.

MS. McCARTHY: So that's another reason,
I think, why we felt we needed to go forward, because
the Applicant had been waiting for that process, and
we really could not tell him with any certainty when
that plan might be completed and adopted.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So when you
2	undertook this planning process, you anticipated it
3	would be completed by now and
4	MS. McCARTHY: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. Now there's
6	some rumor and newspaper accounts that this developer
7	may decide to go build this project as a matter of
8	right. Are you familiar with that?
9	MS. McCARTHY: I've seen that mentioned in
10	the Northeast current, yes.
11	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But you have no
12	knowledge of that?
13	MS. McCARTHY: No.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You think this is
15	a valid PUD and they still want to proceed?
16	MS. McCARTHY: Nobody from the Applicant
17	has indicated to us that they would not go forward
18	with this PUD.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else have
21	questions or comments? Mr. Hildebrand?
22	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Well, it just
23	seems that on the onset that it doesn't meet the area
24	requirement for a PUD, and I'm not sure that it rises
25	to the level of meritorious architecture that would
ı	

warrant consideration beyond that.

MS. McCARTHY: While it doesn't meet the technical standard of 15,000 square feet, there are provisions in the regulations that permit the Commission to determine if the project is sufficiently meritorious at the end of the public hearing that they are willing to waive those minimum size requirements. And, I'm sorry, that was your first concern. And your second one?

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: You addressed the second one.

THE WITNESS: Would you turn on your -COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: You addressed
the second one as well. I was concerned that the
level of architecture exhibited in the drawings, I
think, is it's questionable whether or not it comes up
to the level of exceptional that might be deemed
necessary in the code.

MS. McCARTHY: Right. Well, and that is definitely something that the Commission will have the ability to determine and can send -- by asking those questions now, will clearly send a message to the applicant that you expect higher quality of architecture by the submission of the pre-hearing statement for the public hearing.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. HOOQ?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Madam
3	Chair. Ms. McCarthy, the there's a lot of planning
4	going on up in that area. I wish that kind of
5	planning went on all over the city, to be frankly
6	honest.
7	Let me just say that and I threw that
8	in as a side note. But let me just say that I
9	understand also there's a has the traffic is
10	there also a traffic plan that's also taking place or
11	
12	MS. McCARTHY: The
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know about the
14	development.
15	MS. McCARTHY: Right. The D.C. Department
16	of Transportation did a traffic study of the
L7	Friendship heights area. They weren't able to proceed
18	with one for the entire corridor at that point in
19	time. They are about to initiate a traffic study of
20	the rest of Wisconsin Avenue at this point in time.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was under the
22	impression that the traffic study I know was in
23	Ward 3 was already undertaken, was already
24	underway?
25	MS. McCARTHY: Instead of doing one region

1 wide or area wide study, D-DOT has one in Friendship 2 Heights. 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 4 MS. McCARTHY: They've done one of 5 Connecticut Avenue and sort of Upton Street area. They've done another one of Military Road. So they've 6 7 been doing an area wide look, but it's been in 8 individual pieces focusing on particular problem 9 areas. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll tell you the 11 reason I ask. When I looked in the Applicant's 12 submission, it talks about level of service D, and 13 I've always had a problem with level of service D, 14 even though I know it's up to code, that it's 15 acceptable. 16 But I've always had a problem with that, 17 and I was hoping that if it's set down, that we could 18 really look at that and hopefully we could come up 19 with some mitigation. I don't know what could be 20 done, but I wanted to at least express it now, some 21 litigation issues. 22 Because what it's saying is if this is the 23

Because what it's saying is if this is the developer saying that we -- at least what the Applicant's submission is saying is unacceptable level of service D, similar to background additions during

24

the peak hours. If there's any kind of way that that can be mitigated, because if I see it here, then I would infer that it would only be an attempt to try to even make some kind of mitigation effort. So that's kind of just what I wanted to throw out there, at least make an attempt.

MS. McCARTHY: Right. When -- exactly.

When the Department of Transportation did the study

for Friendship Heights, they concluded that by

approving the timing of the traffic signals in that

section of the corridor, they could improve the level

of service on that street, and we would hope that they

extend that and do the same thing.

In the Tenley Town area, there are also proposals, I know, from the Heckinger's project to make some changes to the configuration of the intersection of where River Road and Wisconsin Avenue come together.

So presumably, that's what D-DOT -- after D-DOT does the projection of demand, they will then look for a variety of methods between traffic single timing and turning radii and the signalizing -- or channelizing intersections and other kinds of traffic engineering techniques to improve the flow of traffic along that section.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.

I was wondering if you would address the concern that,
you know, given that the planning process is not yet
complete for this area, and so we are -- you know, we
really need to focus on the existing comprehensive
plan and the fact that at least a prior Commission
thought that the proper interpretation of the
generalized land use map in the overall context of the
direction that was being given by the comprehensive
plan was to zone the site C2A.

And what's been -- you know, given that many of the things that we, you know, looked to or that you've pointed to as the justification for this being not inconsistent, this proposal being not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, those were already embedded in the comprehensive plan of 1988. So what's been the shift that would justify this proposal?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think if you look at the second -- the generalized land use map, the policy map, what you see around the Tenley Town area are three distinct signals that are sent to indicate that a greater intensity of use than what is necessarily

provided in the existing zoning is acceptable.

One is that Tenley Town is delineated as a multi-neighborhood center. C2A zoning tends to be more for local centers, not for multi-neighborhood centers. It's also delineated as Housing Opportunity Area 2, and housing opportunity -- and unlike our previous case in Tenley Town, where there was a question about the boundaries of the housing opportunity area, in this case, the special treatment area, which is the third category that applies to the specific location in Tenley Town, are delineated in the comp plan as specifically applying to that site. So it's far clearer than it was in the case of the Albermerle case.

And so, over and above what we would find from guidance in the comprehensive plan in terms of the generalized land use map, we find in the policy map clear guidance that says this is an area where we want to emphasize increased housing, where we want to see special treatment in that area.

It's a Metro stop. We find in the zoning regulations, the C2B District is defined as compact, located on arterial streets in uptown centers and at rapid transit stops. You know, all of those are precisely applicable to this particular location along

Tenley Town.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: When was the policy map that you're making reference to? Was that -- when was that put into place? Is that since the down zoning of Wisconsin Avenue in 1988, or was that in place?

MS. McCARTHY: It does not -- it doesn't give a date for each of the symbols and when they were placed on there. I -- we would certainly be happy to go back and see on what edition of the comprehensive plan those were noted.

But I think there's the down zoning, which actually was a largely political event and not really based on extensive planning about impacts, if you go back to the history of that case.

But there's the zoning itself, but the policy symbols and the policy map were intended to provide additional guidance for land use over and above what was already -- how should I say this? The zoning which is established on the site is done to be comparable to the generalized land use map. The policy map is then a set of symbols over and above that, that guide projects like major redevelopment projects.

So the Office of Planning has always

NEAL R. GROSS PORTERS AND TRANSCRI

interpreted that as additional guidance to the generalized land use map and to the zoning that exists there.

Over and above all that, we note that even C2 -- this project is 65 feet and 4.9 FAR. We note that even C2A zoning, you could achieve the 65 feet. You could not -- you could only achieve 3.0. You couldn't achieve a full 4.9. But you could go up to 6.6 FAR in C2B.

So we think what the Applicant has done is stay within the height of C2A, choose a density which is below that, which could be achieved by a PUD under C2B, so they are responsive to the policy guidance that the generalized land use policy map gives us and not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and with the zoning on the site now.

MR. ALTMAN: And I think what that allows that to be achieved and for consideration is that in the comprehensive plan, where it does indicate the striped, mixed use zoning, what you were trying to do is a careful balance in here to actually have buildings that have, as this does, proposed ground floor retail, residential above, at the same time balancing many of the concerns, as Ellen articulated between the height on one hand and yet providing

what's needed in terms of the incentive to create the mixed use and not just a pure residential building, particularly when you're on an arterial block away from the Metro station, and so you are literally on Wisconsin Avenue.

And secondly, and this response to a concern before about why this rises to the level of a PUD, is that we also want to encourage affordable housing and inclusion of affordable housing. That's one of the PUD benefits that's being proffered.

And so, therefore, when you're trying to balance all these objectives of respect scale on the one hand so you're not maxing out the envelope, on the other hand get the mixed use and get the affordable units, that's where the hive and take of where PUD comes in, in terms of why we put this forward.

MS. McCARTHY: That's right, because we just would, in emphasizing -- direct your attention to page 5 of the Office of Planning report, where we cite section 303.2 of the comp plan, saying that policies established in support of our low and moderate income housing objectives include providing zoning incentives as appropriate to developers prepared to build low and moderate income housing, such as permitting additional densities in exchange for incorporating low and

1 moderate income housing and development projects. So we think this gives us very clear 2 3 guidance, along with the recent adoption of transit oriented development policies, articulation of those 4 by the Office of Planning and the Mayor's Taskforce on 5 Transit Oriented Development, that the weight of that 6 policy guidance provides for the proposed project to 7 8 be not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. 9 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Now that you've 10 mentioned the affordable housing component, I just ask 11 that you look at your plan, S9, which seems to have 12 all of the affordable housing clustered on the ground 13 floor, facing the back of Friendship Animal Hospital 14 behind a mechanical room and the elevators. You might 15 look at -- you might ask the Applicant to look at a 16 more equitable way to split that out through the 17 entire building. 18 MS. McCARTHY: We would be happy to do hat. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Commissioner Hildebrand. I think that's a valid 21 observation. 22 23 I just want to make a couple of comments, and then if anyone else has any additional comments. 24

I share Commissioner Hildebrand's concern, and I look

forward to the Applicant responding with a very specific proposal as to the way in which this project is of exceptional merit. It needn't be a design -- it needn't be through the design, but I don't see -- that doesn't -- that should jump on the page, and at the present time, it's not.

And then also just want to share a concern that I've heard everything that you said about height and density and so forth, but this site, it's packed. It's packed on there, which is why they need the variance from the lot occupancy and they don't want to have rear yard and so on. So that's a concern of mine, and I'll share that now and look forward to hearing more about that when we -- when and if we have the hearing.

Anyone else? Mr. Parsons?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I just want to let you know I'll be voting against this because I thin it's premature. I think the planning process is in a fragile state. I don't think this Commission should be conducting hearings on that planning process, which is I think is where we'll end up. I think the architecture doesn't even begin to rise to any threshold of exceptional. And as you said, it's stuffed on the site. It's really pushing the

envelope. So I don't think it's ripe for a hearing.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would just comment. I was looking 8 and 9. One of the things that did jump out at me was the hospital -- is the animal hospital in the back. It -- well, and I will be frankly honest. Bits and pieces, as all of us do, about things in the newspaper. But it's not in Ward 5, so I don't really follow it that much.

But I will tell you -- and I'm serious.

I really haven't followed it that much. I'm very -
I don't have all the inside on exactly what's actually
taking place, and what's going on, and what the issues
are, other than what I read here in the reports.

Butted up to that Friendship Hospital for Animals, and this -- which is A9 -- it looks -- I don't know what the height difference is, but I can tell you that it looks like there could be some room for improvement there. And if it's set down for a hearing, maybe the Applicant can look at that. You know, and when I say room for improvement, I'm talking about the height issue, which obviously is an issue.

And I would agree with Chairperson about it looks -- and there's another rendering where it shows, looks like it's just packed in there. Is that

the issue? Is that what the main thrust of the issue is of the community over development? Is that what the issue is, height?

MS. McCARTHY: I think they have many Changing the underlining zoning is a major issues. But we did hear a lot of concerns about what the shadow and visual impact of the building would be, which is why we put that condition on our recommendation, that definitely before the public hearing, we want to see what the impact of the lack of rear yard and that additional density would be on any of the -- because on the other side of the animal hospital are three single family houses, so we definitely -- there's an alley and there's the animal hospital, which provides a buffer, but we need to see what the views are going to be like from those houses to see what the impact of the building will be to them.

MR. ALTMAN: Let me just say, Commissioner

-- I just want to respond a little bit to Commissioner

Parsons with respect to the planning process. As

Commissioner Parsons knows, there's many planning

processes going on throughout the city at all times,

so we often bring -- this isn't new that we bring a

project to the Commission while there is a planning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

process going on.

We have been going, ongoing, four year, and every neighborhood. Right now, we have nine different planning processes going on, so, you know, we believe that, you know, that you have to make that balancing between doing the long-range view of different neighborhoods, and at the same time projects and development is occurring in the neighborhoods.

And one needs to make a judgement.

We believed that bringing this forward for set down -- remember, this is set down for the hearing -- was appropriate at this point because it did exist, did fit within at least our interpretation of the comprehensive plan, the PUD, that allows for this kind, exactly this kind of engagement of the issues that were discussed, architecture, affordable housing, distribution of the affordable housing, the amenities, the setbacks.

All of that could be discussed, which would be an outcome that I believe the plan would not resolve for you. As Ellen said, supplemental guidance, it wouldn't be sort of resort on a whole new rezoning or a fundamental difference in that, in respect to this site.

And we thought that you could look at this

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on the merits and make a judgement accordingly, allow the community to voice their concerns, go through whether these amenities seem commensurate with relief, and frankly be able to shape a project that would fit within what we think is the comprehensive plan and guidelines for the area.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask this question, Mr. Altman. If this is set down, is there a chance that we won't -- that the gap will be closer, and we won't hear what Commissioner Parsons is saying as far as residents or people in the area coming out and talking about the plan but talking about this plan as the PUD itself?

MR. ALTMAN: Well, you cant avoid people discussing --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, right. I agree, but --

MR. ALTMAN: -- and raising what issues they have. I think, though, the concerns that people have and that they voice about the plan or about a particular project, I think those can be addressed. The concerns that people have, as Ellen said, there are any number of issues that may be there, may be about the setback and may be about the relief ad maybe other things. But I think those can be accomplished

within the context of the specific proposal that's before you.

I don't think that the plan, per se -- in other words, the next -- you know, whether it's six months, nine months, a year of process -- at the end of that time would necessarily shed new light on this particular project that you have before you today.

I'm not saying it wouldn't, but I think that, as you know, we have planning process going on all the time in the city, and we have to make a judgement as to moving forward different proposals as they come to us.

We felt that in light of the relief being requested, in the light of the amenities being provided and the context of the comprehensive plan, that we felt gave very -- you know, gave a justification for this in terms of the mixed use development, that this considered on its merits by you, and that the communities have a chance to voice their concerns as we've heard them. But you'd be able to hear from them, as opposed to us articulating those for you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me rephrase my question. As far as this plan is concerned, if this is set down here today, if it's set down here today, will there still be negotiations going on to work with

1 the overdevelopment group and others to try to narrow the gap or where they're divided? 2 3 MR. ALTMAN: On this project? VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: On this project. 4 5 That's my concern. MR. ALTMAN: Oh, absolutely. I mean, this 6 does not -- as you know, in a set down no way 7 8 precludes further discussion or further modifications to a project. It is not the end of the discussion at 9 10 all. What it says is that this project merits having 11 a public hearing. That hearing is set for whenever 12 the Commission decides to set it. 13 And we've, as you know, we entertained 14 very significant discussions, continuing with the 15 Applicant and with the community up to the hearing. 16 There's a hearing report that reflects those changes, 17 modifications, whatever may be agreed upon by the 18 Applicant or the community. 19 So it hardly says that the project today 20 at set down is the project that will be necessarily be the exact project before you. And, you know, we've 21 22 made many changes and significant changes to projects 23 I'm not saying we would here, but this as a result. doesn't preclude that in any way. 24 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Well,
2	just to move things along, I will move that we set
3	down case number 03-27 for public hearing.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll second it.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there further
6	discussion? All those in favor, please say aye.
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please
9	say no.
10	(Chorus of nays.)
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mrs. Schellin?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff would record the
13	vote three to one to one, to set down case number 03-
14	27.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think you misheard.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Did I?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. It's two to two
18	to one.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought
20	Mr. Hildebrand was in favor.
21	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: No.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Two, two, one. Okay.
23	Commissioner Mitten moving. Commissioner Hood in
24	favor. Commissioners Hildebrand and Parsons against.
25	Commissioner Hannaham not present, not voting.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, can 2 3 I just mention that -- say something about that vote as far as it --4 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you feel compelled to do so. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I just want 8 to tell my colleagues, we have -- and I'm not trying 9 to push it. I'm not saying that -- I know the issues 10 are there. And who knows, we may have a hearing. 11 think the famous George White said everything deserves 12 a hearing. So I would -- a lot of times when we set 13 14 stuff down, actually the negotiation, it gives those 15 residents in the area leverage to be able to get 16 exactly what they want on a project. And I was hoping that that was -- that was 17 18 where I was going with this, to try to see if the 19 height -- because they heard our concerns. 20 So I -- but I have just have a problem 21 with us waiting on a report, from what I'm hearing, 22 that may take three to four years. 23 Now I applaud the efforts of the folks in the community, and everyone knows I'm a community 24 25 person. But I applaud the efforts of everything

everybody is doing.

But some time, it puts pressure on an Applicant and the neighborhood to bridge that gap.

That's why I asked that question. But now we -- the gap is probably going to get even further, and we're going to see another proposal. I guarantee it.

So I just think that we're doing a disservice at least not to afford the opportunity to come down and give them, the Applicant and the citizens, the chance to come together. So did I change anybody's mind? I guess I didn't.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It was a valiant effort. Thank you. We're ready to move to the next case, which is 03-30. This is request by Square 643 Associates, LLC, for consolidated PUD and related map amendment at 734 First Street, Southwest.

And I would like to begin by just disclosing that I did pro bono appraisal work for the Redeemed Temple -- Redeemed Temple? Redeemed Church -- whatever. The church that sold -- I'm sorry, I'm blanking on the name -- but the church that sold the property to the current developer.

And they're no longer involved, so I don't believe that I have a conflict. So I plan to continue, but I did want to disclose that I had done

64 1 that work in the past. So we'll turn to the Office of Planning 2 3 for the overview presentation. MR. LAWSON: Madam Chair, members of the 4 5 Commission, my name is Joel Lawson. I am a Development Review Planner with the D.C. Office of 6 7 Planning. 8 This rezoning and consolidated PUD 9 application would permit the construction of a new 10 condominium in the Southwest Waterfront neighborhood. 11 The property is located on Square 643 in Ward 5 in the 12 Southwest Waterfront neighborhood. It fronts onto H 13 Street, Southwest, which deadends directly to the east of this site. 14 15 The area has a diverse housing stock, 16 including townhouses and both and low and high-rise 17 apartments, constructed as part of the Southwest Urban Renewal Plan of the 1950s through the '70s. 18 19 To the south is the former Randal Junior 20 High School with the Millennium Arts Center, the Randall Recreation Center, a homeless shelter and a 21 22 drug rehabilitation center. 23

To the east of the site are play fields associated with the recreation center. The site is currently developed with a vacant church constructed

24

in the late -- or, sorry, the later 1880s.

This proposal is for the construction of a 60 unit condominium building. The existing church structure would be demolished. Access to ground level and below grade parking would be from H Street, Southwest. The application includes a rezoning of the site from R4 to R5D. Relief would be required for rear yard, side yard, number of roof structure enclosures and roof structure setback.

Immediately prior to this meeting, OP as made aware that the Height Act of 1910 appears to limit height to 70 feet versus the 88.5 feet proposed. OP will work with the Applicant to ensure Height Act conformity prior to the public hearing.

The proposed development is not considered inconsistent with comprehensive plan objectives related to neighborhood stability, housing and urban design, particularly Ward 6 objectives related to neighborhoods in need of improved character.

However, the proposal to remove the existing church structure may be, pending resolution of the historic status of the building, contrary to aspects of the comprehensive plan goals and objectives related to historic preservation in Ward 6.

To date, no application for historic

NEAL R. GROSS REPORTERS AND TRANSCRI

landmark -- sorry -- to date, no application for historic landmark designation has been received by the Historic Preservation Office.

The amenity package by the Applicant includes a provision of new landscaping and a sculptural focal point for the traffic circle at the terminus of Delaware Avenue, and possible improvements to playground equipment or open space on the adjacent Capitol Park 4 property.

The common property -- a common amenity in recent PUD applications is the provision of affordable or subsidized housing. OP has begun discussions with the Applicant regarding the provision of affordable housing units within the development, that is standard, commensurate with other recent PUD applications.

Although the application has many merits, particularly the provision of additional housing in this neighborhood, concerns remain related to the demolition of a potentially significant historic church on the site and the value of the amenity package.

OP feels that it is acceptable and appropriate to set this proposal down for public hearing, but that additional resolution of these

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

issues, as well as the Height Act issue, are required prior to OP making a final recommendation regarding the merits of this application.

This concludes the Office of Planning testimony, and we are available for questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

Lawson. I'm glad you mentioned the Height Act,

because I had a concern that the width of H Street is

80 feet, and therefore the maximum height of this

building could only be 70 feet under the Height Act

provisions.

I think, and I stand to be corrected by my colleagues, but it's a lot to ask to just say, oh, well, we'll sort that out after we set it down and have the hearing. I mean, I think there's going to be dramatic changes that need to take place to the proposal before it's ready for hearing.

So I would like to propose is that we just defer action on this pending a -- I mean, I don't know if there's any legal issue, if we deny it and then they make a different submission. But if there's no prejudice to them to do that, then either to deny it or to defer it, pending a new design. I just don't think this is ready.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I would agree. And the historic preservation issue is hanging out there. I mean, this is a 125-year-old church, and until that's resolved, I just think it's very premature to have this before us.

WICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know how much more I can add. It seems like we're all agreeing, for a change, so I would agree with what I'm hearing. I really think that it is premature, and there's some issues, some outstanding issues that we need to be dealt with before we set it down for a hearing.

about the potential longer term threat to this community of the low density townhouses being rezoned over time and demolished, saying they have asbestos and other structural problems, that we end up completely redoing RLA's plan for a mixed community here. And I'm sure it won't be this generation, but yet another tower amongst these lower townhouses troubles me.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm just

wondering. Is there a planning -- like we've had in

previous cases -- is there a planning study or

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anything going on this area? Because there are a lot of things that we are having in front of us for this 2 3 area, Mr. Lawson. Do you know of a planning study or 4 anything? 5 MR. LAWSON: There are a number of planning studies in the general area, none of which I 6 7 believe covers this particular site. Most of the 8 planning studies are much closer down towards the water. There are also, of course, a lot of important 9 10 development applications, such as Waterside Mall, 11 which is very close by. But no studies that I know 12 that cover the site. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you. 14 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went 15 16 briefly off the record and then went back on the 17 record.) CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Had a little sidebar 18 19 with our attorney. All right. Since I see the 20 direction that we're headed in, and I'd like to give 21 the Applicant's representative a chance to speak, why 22 don't you come forward? 23 MS. GIORDANO: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Cynthia Giordano, Arnold & Porter Law 24 25 Firm, for the record, representing the Applicant.

We'd very much like to move forward with
the set down. We think that it would actually help to
resolve the historic preservation issue. There has
been a very small minority in the community that have
expressed an interest in designation. Have indicated
numerous months ago, about six months ago, that there
might be a designation application forthcoming. And
we just haven't see that yet. We are meeting with the
group that suggested that, after trying to meet with
them for several months, tomorrow evening. We think
that there is a solution, a non-designation solution
that might be a good compromise in everybody's best
interest.
But we would like to just continue to keep
the pressure on, to get the designation issue

resolved, either an application forthcoming or not. And we think the set down would help with that.

With regard to the height issue, we have been talking to the adjacent condominium property next door, which has frontage right adjacent to our site on the circle that could resolve that Height Act issue.

So I think that it could be easily resolved within the existing design.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. preference is still not to go forward, notwithstanding

Ms. Giordano's request. I just think that there's too many loose ends, and I think that the design -- I mean, just to go back to the point that Mr. Parson's made, the -- I focused on the Height Act because the building was too high, and I thought how could you have this just sitting back in this little corner.

But even if that's resolved by figuring out a way to get frontage on the circle, there's still the issue of this property being isolated.

It really doesn't carry out the same theme, in my mind, as the other tall buildings in Southwest because they had, you know, they were tall buildings, but then they had a lot of open area around them to offset that. That's not true of the subject property. And in fact, much of the surface of the site is devoted to the ramp to get down into the parking garage. So it's not quite the same as having open land.

So my view is it's not ready, and I would move that we deny the request for set down without prejudice, and hope that they can come back to us with a more -- a better design.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Second. I wondered if we could ask the Office of Planning to consult with the staff of the Historic Preservation Office to see

1	I mean, waiting for an application or the Zoning
2	Commission forcing an application just, you know,
3	troubles me, that we are the mechanism to force
4	somebody to do something. Why can't we inquire of the
5	staff there as to what they feel about this structure?
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We can certainly
7	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Whether it's
8	eligible for the National Register and those kinds of
9	processes they go through.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We can certainly do
11	that, I guess now, depending on what action we take
12	and what context would they respond to us. But
13	okay. Any further discussion?
14	All those in favor, please say aye.
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: None opposed, Mrs.
17	Schellin.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff will record the
19	vote four to zero to one to deny without prejudice
20	case number 03-30 for set down. Commissioner Mitten
21	moving. Commissioner Parsons seconding.
22	Commissioners Hildebrand and Hood in favor of denial.
23	And Commissioner Hannaham not present, not voting.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Next case
25	for hearing action is case number 04-01. This is the

1 American Pharmacist Association, consolidated PUD and map amendment at 2215 Constitution Avenue, Northwest. 2 3 Ms. Thomas? MS. THOMAS: Good evening, Madam Chair, 4 5 members of the Commission. I'm Karen Thomas, presenting OP's recommendation regarding the American 6 Pharmacist Request for approval of a consolidated PUD 7 and map amendment to permit construction of an annex 8 to an existing building and headquarters at 2115 9 10 Constitution Avenue, Northwest. 11 The headquarters of the American 12 Pharmacist Association sits on 52,973 square feet of 13 land in Square 62, Lot 19, and is zoned SP2, Special 14 Purpose District. 15 An existing three-story rear annex will be 16 demolished and reconstructed as a larger five-story addition, consisting of approximately 166,000 square 17 feet of -- area. 18 19 The Applicant intends to acquire federally 20 owned lots to the north and west of the existing 21 structure for consolidation with Lot 19 as part of its 22 site development. 23 Zoning regulations require that each building be located on its own lot of record. 24 25 Therefore, the proposed consolidation of the abodementioned lots into a single lot of record would meet this criteria.

Due to the lot's unzoned status, map amendment is also being requested in conjunction with the PUD. A map amendment to zone the federally owned parcels SP2 logically follows the zoning of Lot 19.

The proposed development will add another element to the historic landmark designed by John Russell Pope. The architecture and history of the existing structure is well documented and supported in the application's review by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

The Office of Planning feels that the Commission should permit the public hearing as a PUD because of the control which the process provides to the Commission over design, transportation, storm water management and related issues.

This process would allow the Commission to determine the minimum amount of adverse impact on the immediate surroundings, and this would not be possible if the application was put simply as a map amendment.

As outlined in our report, we believe that the density and office use proposed in this development is not inconsistent with the generalized land use plan.

We believe the proposal enables

preservation of the historic character of the

District, as well as the objectives of sections of the

comprehensive plan to foster the District's promotion

and stimulate private sector growth.

We recognize that the proposal before us had significant review by other agencies, including Historic Preservation, Commission of Fine Arts and NCPC, to ensure that construction of this historic landmark is compatible with the architectural character and cultural heritage of the landmark.

The proposed annex seeks to complement the valuable features of the existing structure and those in the immediate vicinity, to which it will be visually related.

Based on review of the application, the

Office of Planning believes that the proposed PUD is

not inconsistent with the elements of the

comprehensive plan, and is consistent with the

requirements of the zoning regulations, and recommends

that the application be set down for public hearing.

We recommend that the Applicant provide for further review, prior to public hearing, a details landscape plan and a detailed storm water management and sediment control plan.

2.0

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms.

Thomas. Any questions for Ms. Thomas? Any questions?

Any comments? Mr. Hildebrand?

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Actually, if -I have -- I would like to know a little bit more about
the rear elevation of the original Pope building.

I note that the existing addition respected the back facade of the Pope building with a minimum connection between the addition and the original building, whereas this is completely encapsulating the rear facade. I'm wondering if the other architectural review commissions commented on that concealment?

MS. THOMAS: I believe that they did, but I don't have that information before me at this time, and will be happy to provide that information.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As I recall, the
Historic Preservation Review Board had insisted on a
little bit of a hyphen there to try to create some
sense of separation between the two buildings, and had
look for a greater hyphen but was -- eventually
approved the design that was there because the
Applicant couldn't -- it was the only way to respect
all of the other aspects of the site and get the

_	program that the Appricant had rooked to achieve on
2	the site in there.
3	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I think it would
4	be nice to augment the package with photographs of the
5	existing rear facade of the original Pope building.
6	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, it might be
7	helpful to share those exercises they've gone through,
8	then. I mean, if they've been through that drill.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anything else?
10	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chairman, I
11	move we set this application down for hearing.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Second. Any further
13	discussion? All those in favor, please say aye.
14	(Chorus of ayes.)
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: None opposed, Mrs.
16	Schellin.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
18	four to zero to one. Commissioner Parsons moving.
19	Commissioner Mitten seconding. Commissioners
20	Hildebrand and Hood in favor. Commissioner Hannaham
21	not present, not voting.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now we'll
23	move to proposed action Mr. Parsons?
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chairman, I
25	unfortunately have another commitment that I have to

1	get to.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So I've left proxy
4	votes on the remaining cases.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
6	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Okay.
8	Under proposed action, case number 03-29, which is the
9	residence hall the PUD for the residence hall at
LO	George Washington University in Square 103.
L1	Couple things, housekeeping things. We
L2	had a late filing by the Foggy Bottom Association that
L3	we specifically had requested the filing, and they
L4	have asked for us to waive our rules to accept the
L5	late filing, which I would be inclined to do because
L6	we had specifically asked for it. So is there a
L7	consensus to accept the late filing from the Foggy
L8	Bottom Association?
L9	Then I understand there are a number of
20	other filings that came in after the date.
21	MR. BASTIDA: That is correct, Madam
22	Chairman. Would you also waive the rules to accept it
23	into the record, because they are related to the late
24	filing?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

They're related --

1	they're all related to the enrollment issue?
2	MR. BASTIDA: Correct.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We have to get
4	copies of them.
5	MR. BASTIDA: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If we what's the
7	consensus, to waive the rules? We have looks like
8	we're going to have an objection. Ms. Prince?
9	MS. PRINCE: On behalf of George
LO	Washington University, Allison Prince of Shaw Pittman.
L1	We have no objection to waiving the rules for the
L2	Foggy Bottom's late filing. That was specifically
L3	requested by this Commission.
L4	I would note, however, that at the time
L5	you requested that material, I confirmed the
L6	Applicant's right to comment on it, and the Applicant
L7	was granted a right to comment on it.
L8	Instead, we now have not only the
L9	Applicant's comment but a comment on the Applicant's
20	comment from ANC's counsel, and I believe there was no
21	provision for that.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
23	Given that I haven't seen the additional submissions,
24	besides the Foggy Bottom Association, based on the
25	representation of Ms. Prince, then I'm not inclined to

1 -- I'm not inclined to allow those into the record. So what's the consensus? 2 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There was a --4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're not Mr. 5 Norton, so I have a problem recognizing you. Norton is their designated counsel. You got any new 6 documentation on that? 7 8 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went briefly off the record and then went back on the 9 10 record.) 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you don't have it, 12 then we're just going to move on. Thanks. 13 All right. What's the consensus regarding 14 taking the other late submissions? I think, you know, 15 I don't think anyone is going to be prejudiced by us 16 not taking these because if there is a legitimate concern about overenrollment there are two other 17 18 avenues that the neighborhood can pursue. They can 19 ask for a compliance review by this office with the 20 conditions of the campus plan order, and they can also 21 ask for enforcement by DCRA. So I don't think, you 22 know, I don't think that there's anyone prejudice to 23 anyone by us going forward. So there were a number of issues that were 24 25 raised, and at the hearing, and I just want to revisit

one briefly, which is the consideration of a planned unit development within an approved campus plan. And I just wanted to again make clear that, you know, campus plans provide -- the campus plan approval process is a special exception process, and it provides certain kinds of flexibility regarding use and density, which can be aggregated, parking which can be aggregated, loading and a variety of things. But it doesn't provide variance relief. So there are two ways that anyone can seek variance

relief. One is to go to the BZA and try and meet the three prong test. And another is to employ the PUD.

So this doesn't in any way supplant the campus plan process. This is just a way of seeking variance, an alternative way of seeking variance relief.

So after I thought about it after the hearing was over, I felt even more comfortable that we could go forward.

So within the context of the -- of this PUD, the relief being sought is rear yard setback. There is no rear yard being provided. And then some minimal relief for penthouse setback lot occupancy and court requirements.

And just to review some of the issues that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have been raised regarding the benefits and amenities being offered.

The benefits and amenities that are proffered are: housing, because of the desire to promote additional on-campus housing; the provision for retain space on the ground floor of the dormitory, as well as Quigleys; the quality of design and materials as being superior relative to what otherwise would have been offered as a matter of right; the streetscape; the fact that housing on campus will have a positive impact on parking; and environmentally sensitive materials.

So the -- those have been called into question to varying degrees by the ANC and the Foggy Bottom Association, but I just wanted to start with that overview.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Other than those two, Madam Chair, the only one that I would have a question. I think we usually don't, and I'm sure you all will help me out, the superior architecture. We usually -- I don't think we usually -- I don't believe, unless it escapes me, that we usually say the architecture is superior. For some reason, I think that we usually reword that. I'm not sure.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, that's an

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	amenity that can be proffered by the Applicant, and
2	usually they use more superlatives than we end up
3	using in our order. But that's what is being
4	proffered in this case, and it's up to us to judge
5	overall, based on everything that's being proffered,
6	whether or not they have met the burden for the relief
7	being sought.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It seems as
9	though, if I recall, a lot of times e do not grant the
10	superior architecture. But you know what I think I'm
11	going to do? I think I spoke too soon. I'm going to
12	let Mr. Hildebrand comment.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr.
14	Hildebrand?
15	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Well, thank you
16	very much, Mr. Hood. Actually, I would like to say
17	that I think that the Applicant has made a general
18	effort to approve the north elevation. And in my
19	opinion, they've brought it up to a level that I would
20	have considered acceptable.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Acceptable as opposed
22	to exceptional?
23	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Yes. You know,
24	I think it meets the acceptable end of exceptional.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Any other

comments on any of the issues that have been raised?

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I would like to ask if there's any way we can put a condition on some control being put in place by George Washington for the move in and move out days to mitigate the impact on the surrounding community, to try to utilize the loading berths to the greatest extent possible, to minimize impact on the street front.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that's sensible. What I would like to do in that regard -- I support that.

Depending on where we end up on this, what I would propose doing is instead of us trying to craft that particular condition, we can reopen the record for that one narrow thing that the Applicant, given that they know how their adjacent facility that I forget -- the service building -- that they could make the first attempt at crafting that condition, but understanding that we expect that on site there would be some accommodation for the move in and move out of the students. And when we say on site, we're meaning the site of the dormitory, as well as the adjacent building, the PUD site.

One of the concerns that I had relates to the retail amenity, which if you look in the proposed

order, on page 20, it says, "No certificate of occupancy shall be issued to the plan unit development unless the Applicant has filed an application for a special exception necessary for the expansion and renovation of Quigleys, located at 619 21st Street, Northwest. Quigleys will be renovated an expanded to provide a food establishment." It doesn't then require them, in the event that the special exception is not granted for them to do anything. So an amenity, you know, it may not be realized depending on the, you know, on the outcome of that process.

So I think we just need to add some language that would, in the event that the special exception is not granted, that the Applicant would have to return to the Commission to provide an alternative amenity, an alternative equivalent amenity.

And the same is true on number 7 in terms of just having a few little loose ends. "If the Applicant has not been successful in locating a retail tenant for the ground level of the project within one year of the date of the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the project, the Applicant shall be required to return to the Zoning Commission to request permission for any alternative use for the space."

Again, after a year, they can -- they have to come back and they're supposed to request for an alternative. The amenity could be totally lost in that. I think we have some language in two other PUDs, the IMF PUD and the 1957 E Street PUD, that speaks more to the effort that the Applicant has to make to get the retain tenant.

And I would like to have similar language incorporated here so that we're sure we're going to get the amenity, not just the one year attempt to get the amenity.

And I did want to comment as well on whether or not the question of providing additional student housing is an amenity. And in this particular case, I think that it is because of what -- of the testimony that we heard. And I would like -- we'll make sure that it's incorporated into the order that this is a site that was not a preferred site for student housing that is now going to have student housing.

And what still remains is that there is another site within Square 103 that is a preferred site for housing. So this truly is an increase in what was anticipated through the campus plan. And that's why I find it to be an amenity.

1 Any other thoughts, comments, conditions 2 to propose? VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I think we've 3 4 already spoken. I'm not sure how we're going to craft 5 the issue from the centralized service delivery facility about the offloading of students when 6 7 they're, I guess, moving in and moving out. I think 8 we can incorporate this letter from the Department of 9 Transportation dated February 23rd so we can kind of 10 wade into the water. 11 We talked about that, I believe? 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. The other 14 thing is, Mr. Hildebrand, I hate to go back to this 15 superior architecture, but I wasn't clear exactly. 16 Did you say it was superior? You wanted an end of it 17 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I think I left 18 19 it at acceptable range of --20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's on the cusp. 21 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: It's on the cusp 22 of exceptional. But what I would like to ask is that 23 we look at item 5 on page 19, (A), (B), (C) and (D), and again consider adding language that these elements 24 25 of flexibility, to address market availability of

1 materials and different elements of design in no way diminish the quality of the design that's being 2 3 proposed and approved. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Excellent. You're 4 5 setting a new standard here, Mr. Hildebrand. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: He sure is, Madam 6 7 Chair, because I'm not -- I'm going back to that 8 superior architecture. I don't think that this is superior architecture. I really don't. And I know --9 10 the cusp is not going to cut it for me. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine. 12 when we have the order drafted and we take final 13 action, we can --14 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Deal with that. 15 Okay. 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We can talk about 17 I just, as we've had discussions in other cases, we each have to weight all of the benefits and 18 19 amenities being proffered for ourselves, and decide 20 whether or not on balance they have met the -- they 21 have provided an adequate number of amenities and 22 benefits for the relief being sought. 23 So in exchange for no rear yard setback, a minor penthouse setback, some flexibility on lot 24 25 occupancy and court requirements, you have to balance

1 It doesn't have to be -- we don't all have to 2 agree on each one. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. 3 4 thought we'd do that in proposed action as opposed to 5 final action? CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I'm just saying 6 in terms of the specific language of the order. 7 8 know, e may each feel that they've met the burden for different reasons, or we may feel that they haven't 9 met the burden for different reasons. 10 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Also, on 12 page 19, "The project shall provide approximately 379 13 beds." I think we need to say something a little more 14 than that. Beds to who? 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We can say --16 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know. 17 Maybe everybody thinks it's sufficient, but 379 beds. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Perhaps -- I don't 19 know if this gives you any comfort or not, but the 20 design of the building is dictated by the plans that we have on the record, and that shows that the 21 22 configuration of the rooms and that they're going to 23 be two bedrooms with two students per bedroom. that's actually part of the order. 24 25 Did you want to say for university

students or --

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I was just thinking it would be -- because of all the problems we keep seeing with people coming down here, if we can be as specific as possible. It doesn't leave room for a future Commission to have to decide -- even though I know it's self-evident or it's there on the paper, you should be understood. But for some reason, and I'm not trying to hash old wounds, but it seems that every time something comes up that's been approved prior, we go back to language, and then we always have a problem figuring it out.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know, and then we run into those kinds of problems. And whatever we can do from this point forth to alleviate concerns and make it as specific and detailed as possible, I think would help at last mitigate some of the confusion that's going on over there.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So shall we add the project shall provide approximately 379 beds for university students?

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would -- yeah, university students.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Even though I think it's supposed to be explicit for freshmen and 2 3 sophomore. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's what they're 5 planning on. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Planning, right. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yeah. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I don't know 8 if we need to limit it to that. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't know that we 10 need to. 11 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ten years from now 13 could be -- I don't know what my happen. 14 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: The only thing 15 I think, saying students is probably acceptable 16 because sometimes upper classmen function as proctors 17 and community advisors for each floor. And I would 18 hate to say something in the language that would 19 preclude them from having an upper level classmen who 20 is more mature and older providing that service. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: True. 22 Anything else? All right. Then I would move approval 23 of case number 03-29 with the changes that we have proposed, and included in this is the -- that we 24 25 reopen the record just to allow the Applicant the

1	opportunity to assist us by drafting a condition
2	regarding the use of the loading berth at the service
3	building during move in and move out.
4	Is there a second?
5	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any further
7	discussion? All those in favor, please see aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How does Mr. Parsons
10	vote?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Parsons left an
12	absentee ballot in favor to approve as written, with
13	the provision that the Commission may make minor
14	technical corrections, which I think covers what you
15	guys have discussed.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: So I would record the vote
18	four to zero to one. Commissioner Mitten moving.
19	Commissioner Hildebrand seconding. Commissioner Hood
20	in favor. Commissioner Parsons in favor by absentee
21	ballot. And Commissioner Hannaham not present, not
22	voting.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I think
24	we can now say the third mayoral appointee not
25	present, not voting, because Mr. Hannaham is not

coming back.

Okay. Under final action. First, if there's anyone here who is still interested in the second, we've deferred that -- postponed that to a special public meeting, March 11, 6:15 p.m. for the second case under final action.

So now we're dealing with 03-06, which is the Southeast Federal Center. And first we need to decide if we will reopen the record to accept a letter from the Consortium of Universities, as well as a supplemental report from the Office of Planning. And I would support reopening the record for those two things.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Then what we have is a request that we allow colleges and university uses to be considered as a special exception in the Southeast Federal Center Overlay, the CR -- is it CR exclusively? CR and SCFCR 5D and R5E.

And we have a proposed -- we have proposed amendments in the first page of the Office of Planning supplemental report that would accomplish that, subject to the regulations in the case of CR, Section

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	ors, and in the case of RSD and RSE, Section 210,
2	which are the campus plan regulations for each of
3	those zones.
4	Is there any discussion or any concerns?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, you
6	need a motion to reopen the record first?
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, we did that by
8	consensus.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You did that.
10	Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What we need now is
12	a motion to basically to incorporate into the final
13	order the language proposed in the Office of Planning
14	report.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And that's I
16	will make a motion that we incorporate the language
17	proposed in the Office of Planning's report dated
18	march the 3rd, 2004, 1903.2 and 1804.2.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Second. Any further
20	discussion? All those in favor, please say aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How does Mr. Parsons
23	vote?
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. parsons votes to
25	approve the amendment as written, so I would record
	1

1	the vote four to zero to one. Commissioner Hood
2	moving. Commissioner Mitten seconding. Commissioner
3	Hildebrand in favor. Commissioner Parsons in favor by
4	absentee ballot. And Commissioner Hannaham not
5	present, not voting, because it hasn't been confirmed
6	yet.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, but he's just
8	gone
9	MS. SCHELLIN: He's just gone.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, we got
11	it. We understand. Okay. Thank you. Now I guess
12	we're ready to move back to action on the minutes.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I'd
14	like to move the minutes in a block with any necessary
15	corrections.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, would you? The
17	only concern that I have is well, I'll second your
18	motion, but I'm going to state my concern is the
19	last set of minutes, which is January 29th, there were
20	three people, three commissioners at the meeting, and
21	those three people are not Mr. Hood as one, Mr.
22	Parsons was one, and Mr. may was one.
23	So I don't know how we can have a vote of
24	three people if those three people are not available.
25	How does that work? You're not following me?

1	MR. BERGSTEIN: No, could you repeat that
2	again?
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would be happy to.
4	We have one set of minutes where there were three
5	Zoning commissioners at the meeting. And one was Mr.
6	Hood, one was Mr. Parsons, and one was Mr. May. So
7	it's not appropriate for me or Mr. Hildebrand to vote
8	on the minutes of a meeting that we did not attend.
9	So how can we get the votes to approve the
10	minutes if Mr. May is no longer on the Commission?
11	It's just one of those technical things.
12	MR. BERGSTEIN: I don't know. Well, I was
13	going to say not at the moment. I think for Mr.
14	Bastida, I'm thinking that you would have to be
15	provided with a transcript. And you would review the
16	transcript and certify that based upon the transcript.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, I'm glad
18	I asked to Mr. Hildebrand, and he'll be happy to vote
19	on the or, no, give the new guy, when he gets here,
20	we'll give it to him.
21	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Exactly. I
22	second that.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The only other
25	thing, Madam Chair, and I'm not sure which set of

	millides this is, Mr. Parsons was recorded as not
2	present, not voting, and I think in this particular
3	case, the Georgetown Boathouse, he should have been
4	recorded as having recused himself.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That is correct.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I think that's
7	very important that that be stated in that matter.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's correct.
9	That's the meeting well, there's a couple things
10	that need corrected in the meeting minutes of December
11	11th, the first being that Mr. Parsons was not there,
12	and then he did not vote on each of the cases for that
13	for the reason of having recused himself.
14	So, yes, in each of those. So in final
15	action, A1, A2 and then proposed action A1. And then
16	I have a few additional edits.
17	So what I would propose, Mr. Hood, if
18	you'll accept it, is that we pull out from your block
19	the meeting minutes of January 29th.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And you're going
21	to read the transcript?
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, the new guy.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, yeah. He's
24	not here. Yeah, okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. So let me

_	Just make sure that we have okay, we re not going
2	to be able to vote on the 11th, either, because Mr.
3	Parsons wasn't there, and Mr. May was the third
4	person. So we can't vote on those either.
5	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Can I move that
6	we give those to the new guy as well?
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. Yes. Because
8	that was extra long. Okay. So we're
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Wait a minute,
10	which new guy, you?
11	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: That would be
12	the other guy.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The new, new guy.
14	Okay, so we're voting on December 8th and January
15	12th. Would you accept that?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I will accept
17	that.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. And so do
19	I, as the seconder. So all those in favor, please say
20	aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And Mr. Hildebrand,
23	I think, is not eligible to vote on the minutes. But
24	we probably, hopefully tell me yes we have an
25	absentee vote from Mr. Parsons?
J	

MS. SCHELLIN: No, we do not.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, all that for
nothing.
MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, we'll
just put all these over. Yeah. Okay. Did you have
a status report for us?
MS. McCARTHY: Yes, Madam Chair. I think
it will be a really brief status report. Just ant to
flag for the Commission, for next month, we expect to
return to the Commission with proposed set down
reports for a PUD at Carver Terrace, a PUD and map
amendment, and which would be an expansion of an
affordable housing project.
And Steuart Investment Company is
requesting a map amendment. They had at one point in
time taken a project out of the DDD through getting
the comprehensive plan amendment. And they would now
like to change that and put the square
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, really?
MS. McCARTHY: back into the downtown
development
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's going to be
fun. That'll be fun.
MS. McCARTHY: Those will be coming up in

1	April.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
3	MS. McCARTHY: And I'd be happy to answer
4	any questions that the Commission has about the rest
5	of the report.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you just say
7	where is Carver Terrace?
8	MS. McCARTHY: It is in Ward 7, I believe.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Really?
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, ma'am.
11	MS. McCARTHY: I stand corrected by Mr.
12	Hood, who says it's in oh, I'm sorry. It's not
13	Carver Terrace. It's Carver
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It says Carver 200
15	MS. McCARTHY: Carver 200
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, I don't know
17	where that is.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let's see. Wait a
19	minute. Right. Oh, yeah well, it's on East
20	Capitol Street, Northeast.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's not Carver
22	Terrace. Carver Terrace is on
23	MS. McCARTHY: Right. No, I had Carver
24	Terrace on the brain because we're doing the Cluster
25	23 planning process there.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. It will be a
2	surprise.
3	MS. McCARTHY: Yeah, it'll be a surprise.
4	Great. Okay.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I had a question.
6	We had set down Fort Totten a while back, and I was
7	wondering where that was or where are we with that?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: We're still waiting for
9	the pre-hearing statement to e filed for Fort Totten.
10	From what I understood, the engineers were out of the
11	country who were working with the consulting engineers
12	with DPW. We have checked with them about two months
13	ago to see if they expected to come back.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But we had set
15	that down for a hearing?
16	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we did.
18	MS. STEINGASSER: A PUD.
19	MR. BASTIDA: Now Mr. Hood, we need to get
20	the application signed by Metro, which I have been in
21	negotiation with DPW to get both a signature on the
22	pre-hearing statement and I'm still waiting for it.
23	I had communications with them about a week to ten
24	days ago, reminding them again that in fact we haven't
25	been able to schedule a hearing because of the lack of

_	chose documents.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
3	MR. BASTIDA: Thank you.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
5	MS. McCARTHY: And I actually, I was
6	remiss. I should note that at the bottom of page 2,
7	second to the last item, our inclusionary housing text
8	amendment, we have finally made it through the
9	procurement process, and just last week signed the
LO	contract with Robinson and Cole, our prime contractors
11	for the inclusionary zoning proposal. So we will
12	reconvene our inclusionary zoning taskforce, and aim
13	to get something, a new inclusionary zoning program,
14	to you in the next several months.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's great.
16	MS. McCARTHY: Yes, we're very excited
17	about that.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anything else?
19	Mr. Bastida, anything else?
20	MR. BASTIDA: The staff had no additional
21	matters that needs action by the Commission at this
22	time.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
24	Bastida.
25	MR. BASTIDA: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And our meeting is
2	now adjourned.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
4	adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	